



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE — WHAT CONSTITUTES INTERSTATE COMMERCE — TAXATION — TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF OIL IN PIPE LINES WITHIN STATE. — A West Virginia statute provides for a tax on all oil transported in pipe lines. (1919 W. VA. ACTS, EXTR. SESSION, c. 5.) The plaintiff's pipe line system consists of the West Virginia portion of a trunk line running from Ohio through West Virginia into Pennsylvania, through which there flows a constant stream of oil, and a network of feeders from West Virginia wells. For oil "gathered" the producer receives a "credit balance" slip. The company must at all times have in its pipes sufficient oil to meet its "credit balances." (1913 W. VA. CODE, § 3564.) The oil is piped to trunk line junction points. The producer pays, under a state tariff, a charge for "gathering" and transporting to the junctions, and a daily storage charge. On sale of the oil, the producer gives the company a "delivery order" if the sale is intrastate, a "tender of shipment" if interstate. The oil delivered is not that which the producer turned over to the company, but any oil of the same grade. The company holds the producers' oil at the junction points only until the trunk line is running oil of the same grade, when it is allowed to flow into the stream whether or not shipment orders have been received. "Delivery" and "shipment" orders are filled by diverting part of the stream. Of six million barrels gathered in West Virginia, one and one quarter millions were delivered in West Virginia, the remainder in Pennsylvania. The state seeks to tax the transportation to the junction points of all oil produced in West Virginia. *Held*, that the tax is unconstitutional as levied on the transportation of oil which ultimately left the state. *The Eureka Pipe Line Co. v. Hallanan, State Tax Commissioner*, U. S. Sup. Ct., Oct. Term, 1921, No. 255.

Whether commerce is interstate or intrastate is a practical question to be determined by the facts of the particular case. See *Chicago, M. & St. P. Ry. v. Iowa*, 233 U. S. 334, 343; *La. R. R. Comm. v. Tex. & Pac. Ry.*, 229 U. S. 336, 341. In the principal case the inquiry must be whether the transportation to the junction points and the transportation beyond were separable. No oil when shipped had a predestination to give the shipment character. It might be delayed at the junction; or it might flow continuously to some point on the trunk line, either within or without the state. In this state of facts the decision of the majority, that the character of the commerce is to be determined by the course which the oil in fact followed, is reasonable. But it is not unreasonable to hold with the minority that the transportation to the junctions was, as a practical matter, separable and intrastate. Neither decision is logically necessary; neither decision is necessary as a matter of practical judgment. The balance being so nearly even, a desire to adjust the power of the state to tax with the Federal power over interstate commerce so as not unduly to restrict either, might well have influenced the court, and led to a contrary result.

LANDLORD AND TENANT — ASSIGNMENT AND SUBLETTING — LIABILITY FOR FAILURE OF LESSOR'S TITLE DISCOVERED AFTER AGREEMENT TO ASSIGN. — The defendant corporation employed the plaintiff to sell certain of its leases. The plaintiff found a purchaser, to whom the defendant contracted to convey. The contract was cancelled because of a failure of title in the defendant's lessors. It was urged as one ground of defense that no covenants for title were implied in the contract to convey. *Held*, that judgment be entered for the defendant. *Miles v. United Oil Co.*, 234 S. W. 209 (Ky.).

If the contract with the prospective purchaser bound the defendant to make out a good title to him the plaintiff may recover his commission, as he has done the acts required, and the failure of the transaction is solely through the breach of contract of the defendant. *Tanenbaum v. Boehm*, 126 App. Div. 731, 111 N. Y. Supp. 185; *Wheelock v. Bornstein*, 214 Mass. 595, 101 N. E.